

The Manifestation of Subjectivity in the Unconscious of Victorian Imagination

Roya Nikandam

Abstract—This study will trace Lacanian psychoanalytic principles narrowed down to the symbolic order and its processes. It examines the unconscious of Victorian cultural traditions in the construction of Tess's identity as commodity in Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, in light of Julia Kristeva's maternity, thereby exploring the female capability to threaten the unconscious of Tess's identity in the Victorian symbolic era. By investigating these theoretical observations, I hope to highlight the continuing issue of commodifying the value and dignity of women which can be observed in the patriarchal system of the Victorian era. A patriarchy can choose to terminate women's existence through exclusion, in order to ensure the stability of the symbolic order. Yet psychoanalytic feminists allow for a paradoxical triumph and show the awareness of women's struggles in the world of patriarchy. In Hardy's novel, it shows the reader that it is not the inferiority of women which leads to their oppression, but instead the attempts of subduing them, in light of tension they can cause to the patriarchy. They could overcome this inferiority and recover it through assigning the capabilities of their potential body, as the feminist psychoanalysts suggest they unconsciously do.

Index Terms—Maternity, psychoanalytic feminists, thomas hardy, victorian age, women

I. INTRODUCTION

I begin the initial part by tracing how in Victorian society women were to a large extent considered as commodities within the patterns of the patriarchal system, which was related to middle class society. I will focus on the economic aspects of the patriarchal society, and place emphasis on the power of men to control female wealth and social position, which led to the exclusion of women from the public sphere. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century in England saw the appearance of the middle classes as a result of the Industrial Revolution. The mid- to late-Victorian period is generally viewed as one in which the ideology of domesticity reached its peak. Eleanor Gordon and Gweneth Nair in their article, *The Myth of the Victorian Patriarchal Family*, discuss that the structure of this ideology is usually associated with the Industrial Revolution and the rising middle classes, particularly those professing an evangelical belief system, which was openly developed to create a separate identity that would firmly differentiate them from the landed people in the society [1]. In fact, in Victorian society women were to a large extent considered as goods within the patterns of the

patriarchal system, which was related to middle class society. There were many different ideas to this ideology, but the most significant in terms of its consequence to the lives of women was the notion of separate spheres. One of these was the private sphere which was the women's domain, and the other was the public, political and economic sphere controlled by men. It is significant since it highlights the authority of men to rule women which came to the point of the prevention of women from the public area. Gordon and Nair add that the role of women within this Victorian domestic ideal was that of moral guardian, and their task was to create a safe place from the harsh realities of the commercial world. The fact that women were excluded from both the economic and political areas of society is laid out in *Family Fortunes*, a seminal work in which social historians, Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, [2] argue that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, "formal political and institutional power remained the preserve of a small group of men." They go on to note that although women could "cajole, persuade, and negotiate, there were many spaces in which they had no place" [2]. I will examine the various responses of nineteenth century critics to the patterns of the patriarchal system and Victorian's portrayal of women. Literary and social critic, Richard Altick argued in his book, *Victorian People and Ideas* that this observable fact occurred as a result of the changes in the British economy. However, he further attributes it to changing attitudes towards the fundamental differences between men and women beginning in the eighteenth century. He asserts that "the nation's increasing wealth and the growing complexity of the mercantile economy required a special kind of managerial expertise which supposedly was a peculiarly masculine gift" [3]. In this way, women were gradually placed in an inferior position economically and were disadvantaged politically. In *Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760*, Michael McKeon [4] emphasizes that:

"By limiting quasi-independent domestic production [toward the end of the eighteenth century], capitalist improvement exerted pressure on what was increasingly understood as "the labor market," so as to throw women in to competition with men. [...] That men tended to prevail in this competition was both a cause and a consequence of developing conceptions of familial income as primarily male income".

Stevi Jackson mentions that in general, married women were not considered legal persons and could not own property. A woman was expected to submit to her husband's authority, to serve him, to minister to his personal needs, as well as to contribute to the prosperity of the

Manuscript received November 15, 2001; revised November 23, 2011.

Roya Nikandam is with the University of Malaya, Departments of English, Faculty of Arts and Social Science. 50603: Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (phone: 0060126573397, e-mail: Roya_200358@yahoo.com).

household enterprise [5]. Jane Mills [6] also mentions that a woman at that time “[was] no more than a bondservant within marriage”. The issue was so important that the women who were not supported by the male-headed family were considered as unusual and kept out of polite society. According to Stana Nenadic [7]:

“[T]he long training required of male professionals, and the consequent late age of marriage, also commonly gave rise to sibling households, in particular the pairing of a bachelor brother with a spinster sister. In these circumstances the sister acted as the household manager in lieu of a wife, and often provided vital professional support to brothers engaged in such areas as medicine or church, where the home was closely associated with professional duties”.

Sophie Bowlby, Susan Gregory, and Linda McKie in their article *Doing Home: Patriarchy, Caring, and Space*, also mention that the image of women as the angel of the house dominated the Victorian middle-class women. Even those who have shown that working-class women did not withdraw from economic activity have tended to accept the view of middle-class women as economically inactive, dependent, and predominantly performing a service role in the household, at least until the late 19th century. All of these strategies were the way to focus on the married woman and neglect single and widowed women. Women who did not follow the rule of the bourgeois housewife were not considered as important as married women [8]. Davidoff has asserted that “as adults, sisters often took over housekeeping roles supported by their brothers in a financial and emotional bond not dissimilar to the conjugal” [1]. Nancy Folbre [9], also mentions that women were allocated as “set of responsibilities to which they have been unfairly assigned”. He believes that “the current organization of social reproduction is unfair, inefficient and probably unsustainable” [9]. F. J. Forman [10] also suggests that “for women, work outside the home brought conflicting loyalties and obligations: in a world where time is money, and where money can mean time, women have little of either”. It came to the point that Victorian society was capitalistic with the focus on the economic aspects of men’s business to make them wealthy, and women were portrayed as commodities under the dominance of men. The capitalist economic society kept women away from the public sphere to put women under the pressure of financial issues and caused women to be sold or forced to accept men in marriage simply because of money. My reference to the term ‘Commodity’ also highlights the Lacanian psychoanalytic notion of ‘subjectivity’ in relation to Victorian women.

Psychoanalytic criticism is an approach, which attempts to interpret literary works utilizing techniques of psychoanalysis [11]. Psychoanalysis itself is the science of curing mental disorders by probing the interaction between the conscious and unconscious [11]. In this part, the theories of Jacques Lacan will be elaborated. It will discuss the issues relating to the identity of women in the Lacan’s concepts. Jacques is French psychoanalyst (1901-1988). Whose works have been exceptional influence on literature as his ideas seem to appeal more to the feminists. Instead of attempting to look at the Freudian unconscious and conscious from a new angle, he tried to allocate more importance to the

unconscious as the core of our being and he claimed that the unconscious is structured like a language [12]. Hence, differences could be found between Freud’s theories and Lacan’s revisions of them; for instance Bertens [13] believes that Lacan’s work “avoids the fixed development scheme that Freud proposed and instead proposes a relational structure that allows for difference”. According to Lacan, language is central to investigating the unconscious because they both complex structures and because the analyst, in investigating the unconscious, is always using and examining language [14]. He divided three models of human psyche: Real, Imaginary, and Symbolic. Deborah Madsen [15] in her book *Feminist Theory and Practice*, clarified Lacan’s notion of Pre-Oedipal stage as “no language to express the experience of difference between self and other” and they identify themselves with the mother. In this stage children are unable to express themselves through words and they are subject to impressions and fantasies. By entering the mirror stage, the child sees its own reflection in the mirror and realizes that he or she is a unified being separate from the mother and the world. The next stage is Symbolic Order which is the name chosen for Freud’s Oedipal stage and it is the stage that children lose “primal and maternal identification” [15]. Lacan contends that in the symbolic order, we learn to differentiate between male and female [16]. For Lacan, the symbolic is “the logical and syntactic functioning of language and everything which, in translinguistic practices is assimilable to the system of language proper” [17]. Lacan believes that the symbolic corresponds to the Oedipal and post-oedipal periods during which the child comes to individuals itself from others and to recognize itself as an I-he or I-she. Therefore, this identificatory change requires the child to renounce its desire to fuse with its mother. Psychic castration, then, is the awareness of this separation. According to Lacan, “the Oedipal crisis occurs during the process of language when the child learns its society’s sexual rules” [18]. In other words, to become a speaking subject, the infant has to be subjected to the laws and rules of language. Lacan designates the idea of structure of language as specifically paternal. He calls the rules of language the Law of the Father in order to link the entry into the symbolic, the structure of the language, to Freud’s notions of Oedipal and castration complexes. Therefore the Name of the Father and the No of the Father is a metaphor for the paternal function. The symbolic paternal function in the Oedipus crisis is “the effective third that mediates symbolic castration, the law against incest, the release from the dual mode of relating, and thus accession to the symbolic order” [19]. Lacan writes that the Name-of-the-Father operates “in the place first symbolized by the operation of the absence of the mother” [20]. These phrases imply that the father’s emergence between the child and the mother forces the child to recognize alienation and separation and to use language to differentiate between itself and Others. Then the child experiences a system of linguistic differences and therefore accepts language’s predetermined position in such binary oppositions as male/female, father/son and so on. Consequently linguistic expressions transform the child from the unity of being to split social being. Lacan’s symbolic order, which is loosely related to Freud’s reality principle, “is

the realm of law, language, society, and cultural beliefs. Entrance into the symbolic order determines subjectivity according to a primary law of referentiality that male sign (phallus) is as its ordering principle” [21]. Thus, the phallus is part of the symbolic order into which the child is born: “It is not something he creates, but something her encounters” [22]. In *Seminar VII, the Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, Lacan [23] describes the phallus as a lack which is brought into being:

“The phallus represents the intrusion of vital trusting or growth as such, as what cannot enter the domain of signifier without being *barred* from it, that is to say covered over by castration [...] It is at the level of the order, in the place where castration manifests itself in the order; it is in the mother-for both girls and boys-that what is called the castration complex is instituted. It is the desire of the other which is marked by the bar”.

Lacan calls this Other Phallus. It is the transcendental ideal that every living being attempts to grasp. Every being is incomplete, but for a baby it takes time to recognize his/her insufficiencies. Phallus or Other or Center is the desired object, which is able to release a person from the disturbing sense of loss and incompleteness [24]. Lacan believed that masculine and feminine positions are functions, and not only a biological fact. For him, “The phallus as the signifier clarifies the structure that will govern the relationship between the sexes; the two sexes are positioned as such a mode of *being* (for the feminine), and *having* (for the masculine), the phallus” [17]. So, when the gender division occurs in the unconscious, the value given to the masculine is more than the value given to the feminine. Hence, phallus is considered the value which its absence is defined as lack of value. The phallus stands for value, measure of authority and law. Therefore, the two sexes are divided into the two modes of being the phallus for the feminine and having the phallus for masculine. In French as in English, the verb is modified by its conjugation with either being (*être*) or having (*avoir*) [17]. The “being” being differ from the “having being” since phallus as what determines the identity of men and women in the society. Men are recognizes as subjects who can exchange women among them and silence them. Lacan believes that it is in the symbolic stage that a child becomes aware of its separation from its mother, and through absence or lack reflects the desire for another or for the mother. As the result, the awareness of separation is castration [25]. In other words, the separation from the mother brings the castration complex for both sexes in which:

“The man is ‘castrated’ by not being total, just as the woman is ‘castrated’ by not being a man. The man’s lack of wholeness is projected onto woman’s lack of phallus, lack of maleness. Woman is then the figuration of phallic ‘lack’: she is a hole” [26].

Therefore the big difference between the sexes which causes the protest of many feminists is clarified here: “men try to deny their separation or alienation through their affirmation of phallic means of mastery” [25]. The assumption of phallus is what induces men have more narcissistic feelings towards themselves as they recognize women as incomplete. In addition, Lacan’s assumption was that the girl castration complex functions to ensure that she accepts her castrated condition as a *fait accompli*:

“She ‘resolves’ her oedipal entanglements by accepting that she does not have the phallus. However, as a recompense for her turning from the mother to the father as her primary love-object, she acquires a number of reactive strategies and devices for gaining pleasure even if she has had to relinquish the active pre-oedipal position.” [17]

For Lacan, the girl should use techniques which include: “Seductive, coquettish behaviour, narcissism, vanity, jealousy, and a weaker sense of justice-are a consequence of her acceptance of her lack (of the phallus)” [17].

They are strategies developed to ensure that, even if she may become the phallus, the object of desire for another [17]. A woman, then, adopts a seductive, coquettish attitude as the result of her attempt to become the phallus or the object of the desire for the other. So Tess’s reduction to objects of desire will later be subsumed under the category of patriarchy’s regulation of women.

II. TESS’S REGULATION IN THE SYMBOLIC ORDER

I choose Lacan’s psychoanalytic theory is as a way to understand the psyche or the unconscious of the Victorian construction of women. It will help explain the construction of Tess as commodity within the Victorian cultural tradition in order to obtain a better understanding of the unconscious of the Victorian cultural norms, which relates to making women passive and muted. Moreover, Lacanian psychoanalytic theories will aid to clarify my argument that Hardy, overwhelmed with his unconscious bias as a male writer, shapes his female characters accordingly. Hardy not only portrays his female characters as commodities, but also stands as a symbol of a deeply patriarchal Victorian society, since it is through his portrayal that these values are reinforced. It can be seen in *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* that the first bearer of the Name of the Father, whose authority and power exhibits itself through language, is Alec, who suppresses Tess. Alec’s patriarchal language is manifested in his conversation with Tess in their first meeting in the fruit-garden at Trantridge. The reader notices the way Alec gazes at Tess—as the possessor of the phallus that desires Tess’ phallic body. Based on Lacan’s assumption, Alec is position as a speaking being and his subjectivity is affirmed by the phallic as a sign of mastery. It is here that Tess doesn’t have the phallus, so she becomes the object of desire for Alec.

He stood up and held strawberries by the stem to Tess’ mouth: ‘No-no!’ she said quickly, putting her fingers between his hand and her lips. ‘I would rather take it in my own hand.’ ‘Nonsense!’ he insisted; and in a slight distress she parted her lips and took it in [27].

Tess has entered the world of language, authority, and symbolic laws. Alec displays the law of the father here. Alec’s function is masculine and he is positioned as having the phallus. It is only through the having the phallus that cultural value and dignity is given to him. It is here that we notice the power and patriarchal language that he uses to suppress Tess. As Kristeva mentions, “the sociosymbolic contract has been a sacrificial contract” [25]. Tess is sacrificed by the symbolic Victorian law. She obeys Alec’s

patriarchal request; and her reaction to this lawful language should be observed as well: “Tess eating in a half-pleased, half-reluctant state whatever d’Urberville offered her” [27]. The second meeting between Alec and Tess takes place in his gig. Alec as the possessor of phallus desires Tess’s phallic body. While the phallus provides all meaning, Alec manifests its power to Tess. Tess presents her role as lack in the symbolic Victorian society: “‘now damn it—I’ll break both our necks!’ [27] swore her capriciously passionate companion. ‘So you can go from your word like that, you young witch, can you?’” [27]. Alec’s forceful words to Tess highlight the function of patriarchal symbolic order, in which her identity has been denied and destroyed. She seems to exist outside the social system, her subjectivity under the control of rules and traditions. With Alec’s authority, Tess is observed as a sexual object. “[Alec] knelt and bent lower, till her breath warmed his face, and in a moment his cheek was in contact with hers. She was sleeping soundly, and upon her eyelashes there lingered tears” [27]. Alec observes Tess as a sexual object. He assumes Tess to be only sexual object for him to satisfy his desire. Although Tess resists his advances, he does not give up on her. She is only beautiful object for him. The second bearer of the Name of the Father in Tess’ life is Angel. Angel grows up in “the symbolic order [...] which is governed by the paternal metaphor and the imposition of the paternal law” [28]. Angel chooses Tess for marriage based on the rules of a patriarchal culture and the symbolic law that defines her as a pure and saintly woman. However, when Angel finds out that Tess has had sexual relationship outside the marriage (even though it was against her will) it leads him to look upon her as a guilty woman. The superiority and power of law in Angel’s blood is so full of strength that Tess’ plea for forgiveness is rejected and Angel said that “O Tess, forgiveness does not apply to the case! You were one person; now you are another. My God-how can forgiveness meet such a grotesque-prestidigitation as that!” [27]. Angel as the valued party and the possessor of authority, believes that Tess is not good enough for marriage since she is not virgin. Tess fails to become the phallus for Angel to extend his position and power. She was excluded from the symbolic conception of Angel and was repudiated because of her past deeds. According to Joseph Mahan, “in the nineteenth century, it is the woman who incurs the social stigma for behavior for which men may be chiefly to blame” [29]. Tess’s realization of her fate reflects Lacan’s statement that “the symbolic order which, as andro- or phallogocentric, is governed by the father’s law” [18]. Tess is suffering under the patriarchal norms which lead to the shattering of her subjectivity. It happens when the symbolic world rejects her as an unchaste that violated the law, and her identity is formed in the patriarchal society which considers unchaste as a dishonor to the family. Alec and Angel assume Tess to be only a sexual object to satisfy their desire and she is expected to become a commodity, the one who served them best. Therefore, Lacan’s postulation on the symbolic order and its processes clarify the identity constructed for Tess as commodity in the patriarchal world.

III. TESS’S OVERCOMING HER REGULATION IN THE SYMBOLIC ORDER

Freud and Lacan, two well-known psychologists, gave detailed accounts of the psychological development of human beings. However, the theories of these two psychologists generated controversy among feminists as some showed approval and others displayed disapproval towards Freud’s theories. The dispute over the relationship between psychoanalysis and feminism seems to be started by Kate Millet’s book *Sexual Politics* (1969) in which she argues that feminists should denounce Freud’s theories as they advocate patriarchal power or, as David Glover and Cora Kaplan [30] explain, Freudian psychoanalysis is the “whipping boy for the general misogyny of the dominant culture”. Being influenced by Millet, some feminists had the opinion that even in the relationship between an analyst and a patient abuse of power is practiced as analysts were mostly male and the patients were female. To defend Freud against Millet’s accusation, Juliet Mitchell published her book entitled *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* in which she argued that Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis provide a useful conceptual framework for understanding the construction of human sexuality. She believes that the apparent phallogocentrism of psychoanalysis is descriptive of the state of society rather than a precondition of human socially [31]. Provoked by Millet’s view of Freud and Jacques Lacan’s theories as the origin of women’s oppression, Julia Kristeva challenged Lacan’s ideas of imaginary world and the symbolic world that have been widely used to understand the development of the personality of women in social constructions. It will discuss how her perspective manifests the emancipation of Tess from her status as commodity. Kristeva asserts that women’s procreative ability is controlled and subordinated in the Symbolic world since it has always been considered a threat and insecurity. She tries to explain the symbolic world’s attempt to diminish women’s power to reproduce by associating pregnancy with women’s experience of negativity, which is the process of liquefying the rational attempt to define and stabilize thought and language [32].

For Kristeva, pregnancy is the impossible state of supporting and destruction of the symbolic order in which women take relish in having a split identity of plural which Cixous calls “not-me with me” and one. So, Kristeva believes that motherhood “blurs the distinction between self and other” [33]. Tess causes anxiety in her mother when she tells her about pregnancy:

“Then Tess went up to her mother, put her face upon Joan’s neck and told ‘and yet th’st not got him to marry ‘ee! reiterated her mother. ‘Any woman would have done it but you, after that!’ perhaps any woman would except me.’ “It would have been something like a story to come back with, if you had!’ continued Mrs.Durbeyfield, ready to burst into tears of vexation. After all the talk about you and him which has reached us here, who would have expected it end like this! Why didn’t ye think of doing some good for your family instead o’ thinking about of yourself?” [27].

For Joan, who here represents the symbolic world, Tess’ pregnancy is a disruptive force since she creates tension and

ambivalence in the symbolic world: “the site of motherhood gains its subversive potential as “the threshold of nature and culture,’ the woman who is both *mother*, guarantor of the community and *other*, the polymorphic, orgasmic body, laughing and desiring” [34]. Thus Tess, who now assumes the status of a reproductive entity, finds herself empowered by her condition; this is manifested somewhat in her treatment of the young girls of Marlott, her former school-fellows and acquaintances:

“At moments, in spite of thought, she would reply to their inquires with a manner of superiority, as if recognizing that her experience in the field of courtship had, indeed, been slightly enviable. But so far was she from being, in the words of Robert South, ‘in love with her ruin’ [...]” [27].

Tess can feel powerful in the patriarchal world when she becomes pregnant. Her connection to maternal love gives her the strength to resist her exclusion from the society, and the strength for her to destabilize the authority of conventions. “If she could have been but just created, to discover herself as a spouseless mother, with no experience of life except as the parent of a nameless child, would the position have caused her to despair? No, she would have taken it calmly, and found pleasures therein” [27]. The maternal love of Tess is significant, since it functions to break the dogmatic rules of the symbolic world. When Sorrow becomes very sick and has to be baptized to be save, Tess’s feelings of love toward him, and her ethics cause her to speak on two distinct levels: in the traditional speech of the patriarchy, as she symbolically uses words to save her baby’s soul, and from the heart as she gathers up her strength to break the norms of society: “the baby’s offence against society in coming into the world was forgotten by the girl-mother; her soul’s desire was to continue that offence by preserving the life of the child” [27]. As Kristeva [35] states:

“Now, if a contemporary ethics is no longer seen as being the same as morality; if ethics amounts to not avoiding the embarrassing and inevitable problematics of the law but giving it flesh, language, and jouissance—in that case its reformulation demands the contribution of women. Of women who harbor the desire to reproduce (to have stability). Of women who are available so that our speaking species, which knows it is mortal, might withstand death. Of mothers. For an heretical ethics separated from morality, an herethics, is perhaps no more than that which in life makes bonds, thoughts, and therefore the thought of death, bearable, herethics is undeath [amort], love.”

Kristeva talks about ethics which is about love between mother and child. Kristeva’s ethics opens a way for Tess to have subjectivity via law and the symbolic. A Tess-Sorrow relationship depicts a way to undoing social norms. She does right for her child not just out of law but out of affection (love) and “this love is not just for an other but for what was once in her and for the species, for the singular other and for the universal”. [36]. Tess makes a break with social norms and baptizes Sorrow herself, showcasing that woman does indeed possess the ability to break social norms through maternity. As she christens her child, she not only utters the “sanctioned sacrament,” but also ascends into rhapsody, for she speaks “boldly and triumphantly in the stopt-diapason note which her voice acquired when her heart was in her speech” [27].

When Tess initially meets the Vicar to arrange to give the child a Christian burial, she asks him to speak to her as a person (“me myself”), not a man representing the views and expectations of patriarchal institutions, the “saint” to her “sinner.” She speaks to him through her maternity, a state that empowers her:

“Undo the dualisms of mind/body, culture/nature, and word/flesh. The mother does right for her child not just out of duty (law) but out of love, a love that is not just for an other but for what was once in her and for the species, for the singular other and for the universal” [36].

The symbolic language of Vicar is threatened with the semiotic language of the unwed mother: Tess’ heart-felt language is, in a sense, more divine than the former. Later, when Tess asks if her “extemporized ordinance” was “doctrinally sufficient” to count as a real baptism, she is rewarded with an answer of “it will be just the same” [27]. All this serves to show that when Tess speaks her maternal language, from the body, she becomes powerful. Her physical presence, informed by this experience of motherhood, destabilizes Tess’ symbolic position as she changes “from simple girl to complex woman”; her soul now “that of a woman whom the turbulent experiences of the last year or two had quite failed to demoralize” [27].

IV. CONCLUSION

It has been clarified that based on Jacques Lacan’s symbolic order and its processes, the identity of Tess is transformed to one that best serve the patriarchy. Her identity becomes bound up with the meanings and the values of the symbolic rules and the power that the metaphor and phallus give her. She is expected to have a lack of subjectivity in order to exist in the Victorian society. It also has been clarified that women have some ability to shatter the symbolic, patriarchal world. Julia Kristeva’s notion of maternity helps Hardy’s Tess to regain her ruined subjectivity within the Victorian tradition. Employing the theory of Kristeva allows to emerge the view that women do possess the ability shake the stability of the patriarchy by relying on their attachment to maternity. They could overcome this inferiority and recover inferiority through assigning the capabilities of their potential body, as the feminist psychoanalysts suggest they unconsciously do. This study also would like to suggest that the Victorian values still persist in terms of women being considered as commodities even today. However, through this fixed norm point of view of women, this study attempts to shatter the incorrect historical, cultural, and social perspectives of women. This study also highlights the challenge for the supporters of women’s rights that women have many abilities, capabilities, and talented traits which are equal to men and even in some case, they can manifest their superiority over men as shown in the heroine in Hardy novel. I personally believe that women do not belong to anybody but themselves. They must step towards presenting their hidden, potential, and intellectual proficiency to break the building of women’s identities as commodities in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

My special thanks are due to my supervisor, Dr. Shalini Teresa Fernandez whose superb organizational skills and judicious readings aided me immeasurably in bringing the paper to completion. Dr. Shalini's breadth of knowledge and enthusiastic approach to her reading my study has inspired me anew. I owe her a debt of special importance which can never be repaid. Special thanks are also extended to Dr. Noritah Omar, who guided, invigorated, and inspired me. She has unfailingly offered sagacious advice and friendly encouragement.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Eleanor and G. Nair. "The Myth of the Victorian Patriarchal family." *The History of the Family* vol. 7, pp.125-38, 2002.
- [2] D. Leonore and C. Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- [3] A. Richard D. *Victorian People and Ideas*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1973.
- [4] M. Michael. "Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28.3, pp.295-322, 1995.
- [5] J. Stevi. "Toward a Historical Sociology of Housework: A Materialist Feminist Analysis." *Pergamon* 15.2 153-172, 1992.
- [6] M. Jane. *Womanwords*. New York: Henry Holt, 1993.
- [7] N. Stana. *The Victorian Middle Classes* ed, H. W. Fraser and I. Mavor. 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- [8] B. Sophie, S. Gregory, and L. McKie, "Doing Home: Patriarchy, Caring, and Space." *Pergamon* 20.3 pp. 343-50, 1997.
- [9] F. Nancy. *Who Pays for the Kids?* London: Routledge, 1994.
- [10] F. J. Forman, ed, *Taking our Time*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1989.
- [11] P. Barry, *Beginning Theory, an Introduction to Literature and Cultural Theory*. Oxford, Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1995.
- [12] L. J. E. J. Lacan, "Jacque Lacan. Ecrits: a Selection." *Library Journal*, 127. 19 15 November, pp. 88, 2002.
- [13] B. Hans. *Literary Theory the Basics*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- [14] P. Michael. *Theory: An Introduction to Lacan, Derrida, and Kristeva*. London: Blackwell, 1993.
- [15] M. L. Deborah. *Feminist Theory and Literary Practice*. London: Pluto Press, 2000.
- [16] C. E. Bressler, *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice*. 4thth ed., London: Pearson Prentice Hall., 1994.
- [17] G. Elizabeth. *Lacan: A Feminist Introduction*: London: Routledge, 1990.
- [18] F. Nancy and S. Lee Bartky, ed, *Revaluating French feminism: Critical Essays on Difference, Agency, and Culture*. .Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Putra, 2002.
- [19] J. H. Smith, *Arguing with Lacan: Ego Psychology and Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- [20] Z. Emily. *Inheriting the Law: The Birth of Sexual Difference*. Dissertation, New York University, 1997.
- [21] M. Iraj. *A Poststructural Analysis of Subject in Virginia Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway*. Master. Dissertation, Dept. Modern Language, Islamic Azad University, 2006.
- [22] W. Anthony, *Lacan and the Discourse of the Other*. London: John Hopkins University of Press, 1968.
- [23] L. Jacques. *Seminar VII, the Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. Tans. Dennis Porter. New York: Norton, 1992.
- [24] P. Michael, *Theory: An Introduction to Lacan, Derrida, and Kristeva*. London: Blackwell, 1993.
- [25] D. Josephine. *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions of American Feminism*. New York: Continuum, 1992.
- [26] H. R. Baharak. *A Psychoanalytic Feminist Reading of Ten Novels by Nagib Mahfouz*. PhD. Dissertation, Dept. Modern Language and Communication, University Putra Malaysia, 2005.
- [27] H. Thomas, *Tess of the d'Urbervilles: a Pure Woman*.ed.C.Day Lewis.London: Collins, 1958.
- [28] H. Sean. *Jacques. Lacan*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- [29] A. A. Hana. *Sexual Science as Manifested in Hardy's arriage Plot*. Master. Dissertation, Dept. Modern Language, and Communication University Putra Malaysia, 2003.
- [30] G. David and K. Cora, *Genders*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- [31] H. Maggie. *Feminist Criticism: Women as Contemporary Critics*. Britain: The Harvester Press, 1993.
- [32] W. M. Boulouse. *Philosophy the Maternal and Body*. New York, Routledge, 1998.
- [33] C. Mary. "The Abject Maternal: Kristeva's Theoretical onsistency." *Women and Language* vol. 2, pp. 32-7, 1993.
- [34] A. Alison. *The Ethics of Sexual Difference, Abjection, elonacholia and Love: The Work of Julia Kristeva* ed, John Fletcher and Andrew Benjamin. London: Routledge, 1990.
- [35] K. Julia. *Tales of Love*. Trans. S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- [36] M. Noelle. *Julia Kristeva*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Roya Nikandam was born in Kerman, Iran, in 1984. She had her primary education in Kerman in 1990 and graduated from Reyhaneh High School in 2002. She obtained her Bachelor of English Literature degree from the Islamic Azad University in 2006. She continued with her Masters degree in the field of Literature in English at Universiti Putra Malaysia in 2009. She kept studying her Ph.D in the field of English Literature in University of Malaya in 2009. And it is still on going.

She worked at Institution of Kish Air from 2002 to 2004. She was as an English tutor a level of English from 2005 to 2006. She was the editor of broad club ISAM group at university of Putra Malaysia from 2006 to 2008.